

Name of Committee: Override Study Committee – Capital Subcommittee

Meeting Date: November 21, 2013 (Meeting #3)    Time: 7:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.

Meeting Location: Town Hall, Room 111

Members Present:

X	Carol Levin		Lisa Serafin Sheehan
X	Sergio Modigliani	X	Timothy Sullivan

Staff Present: Peter Rowe and Sean Cronin

School Committee Members Present and Participating: Helen Charlupski and Susan Wolf-Ditkoff

The minutes from the November 7, 2013 meeting were approved.

Topic: Preparation of questions for HMFH visit on December 5. The attached PDF files of the whiteboard are attached as an addendum to these minutes.

Sergio opened the discussion by presenting a brief history of HMFH's history with the Town of Brookline. HMFH prepared the 1993 study of BHS, the 2011-2012 Devotion Concept Study, the August 2013 B-Space Analysis and the September 2013 BHS study. Susan pointed out that B-Space was not charged with exploring options for BHS, but nevertheless made a recommendation to remain a one high school system. The School Committee felt this topic needed additional study. Peter reported the HMFH was hired to do an initial BHS study prior to B-Space issuing its conclusions.

Sergio returned the discussion to the issues addressing the Capital Subcommittee and what questions to ask HMFH. He pointed out that to obtain MSBA funding, a project must meet MSBA standards. Those standards, in turn, are a large determinant of how much space is built and what the space looks like, which in turn drives project costs. Costs can be divided into capital, hard and soft costs. Hard costs include construction and FF&E, soft costs include administration, professional fees, transportation and management costs. In addition, Sergio pointed out that any increase in facilities will have a direct impact on future operating budgets. (See Nov 21 Whiteboard 1.pdf).

Tim raised the question of what can this subcommittee hope to accomplish by March 1, 2014. Sergio noted that the modular classrooms at Lawrence are a “done deal” and therefore off the table. The discussion then turned to the Devotion project. Peter Rowe told the committee the decision on the Devotion project predates the enrollment crisis, and dates back to decisions made on the order in which the elementary schools were to be renovated. The original Devotion renovation was programmed for 830 students. On November 19, 2013, the town received permission from MSBA to increase the project to accommodate 1000 students. Since HMFH has performed a significant amount of work on the Devotion project, and only limited work on

the other K-8 projects, Sergio recommended focusing our questions on Devotion and BHS. Of particular interest is how the expansion of the Devotion project will impact the projected costs, HMFH's timeline for developing those costs, and understanding how the HMFH timeline will mesh with that of the subcommittee.

Sean provided information on expected levels of MSBA reimbursement. There is a "base" reimbursement of 30% of project costs, with additional points for other items desired by MSBA. However, the true constraint is a hard cap of \$275/square foot of hard costs. Therefore, Sean feels a reimbursement of 35% of project costs is a reasonable assumption at this time.

The timeline for the Driscoll project was then discussed. A statement of interest to the MSBA must be submitted between January and April 2014. Peter Rowe believes the earliest an "Invitation to Feasibility" would be issued is January 2015. The projected occupancy date for a renovated Driscoll is 2018.

There was a brief discussion on whether B-Space adequately explored alternatives for the development of a 9th K-8 School. Carol suggested a development consultant could be retained to explore site options for an additional school while the town awaits an Invitation to Feasibility from MSBA on the Driscoll project. The opportunity to create a ninth school at the Old Lincoln School (OLS) was briefly discussed, including previous ideas to deck Route 9. (Nov 21 whiteboard 2.pdf)

A general discussion then ensued on whether this subcommittee would be recommending whether the town should pursue an override to fund the Devotion project, and if so why and what are the subcommittee's responsibilities regarding the future capital projects being proposed to accommodate enrollment growth. A general consensus was reached that at a minimum, the subcommittee should recommend prudent issues and approaches which should be addressed in capital decision making.

The discussion then focused on whether this subcommittee should be examining the operating expense ramifications of the alternative capital decisions. Susan requested we identify potential areas of overlap with other subcommittees.

Sergio asked Helen and Susan what the School committee is doing in response to the HMFH BHS report. They reported that on September 19 the School committee voted to study the educational and operational issues surrounding enrollment growth and space at BHS. (Nov 21 whiteboard 3.pdf)

Sergio will incorporate today's discussions into the questions being submitted to HMFH, and circulate a draft to the committee members, the Peter, Sean, Susan and Helen.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45.